

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

JEROME TALLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

LONNY R. SUKO,

Defendant.

No. C15-5721 BHS-KLS

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
Noted For: November 20, 2015

Plaintiff Jerome Talley, a pretrial detainee being held at Kitsap County Jail, filed a proposed complaint in this civil rights action on October 8, 2015. Dkt. 1. Plaintiff did not pay the filing fee or submit an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Plaintiff has over fifteen §1983 cases currently pending before this Court. On September 24, 2015, Senior District Judge Lonny R. Suko entered an order denying Plaintiff's application to proceed IFP in *Talley v. Sias, et al.*, 3:15-cv-5501-LRS (W.D. Wash) because Plaintiff incurred at least three "strikes" prior to initiating the lawsuit. Judge Suko also denied the applications to proceed IFP in *Talley v. Congalton, et al.*, 3:15-cv-5534-LRS (W.D. Wash) and *Talley v. Creatura*, 3:15-cv-5585-LRS (W.D. Wash) because Plaintiff has incurred at least three "strikes."

Concurring with Judge Suoko, this Court finds Plaintiff incurred the following "strikes" prior to filing this lawsuit: *Talley v. Holevinski* (E.D. Wash Case No. 02:99-cv-5036); *Talley v. Bailey, et al.* (W.D. Wash Case No. 2:08-cv-00677-TSZ); *Talley v. Bailey, et al. (II)* (W.D. Wash

Case No. 2:08-cv-00752-RSM); and *Talley v. Rogers* (W.D. Wash Case No. 2:08-cv-01761-TSZ). *See also Talley v. Sias, et al.*, 3:15-cv-5501-LRS (W.D. Wash)¹.

DISCUSSION

Because Plaintiff has incurred at least three strikes, he may not proceed IFP unless he can show he is “under imminent danger of serious physical injury.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The imminent danger exception requires a prisoner allege a danger which is “ready to take place” or “hanging threateningly over one’s head.” *Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493 F.3d 1047, 1056 (9th Cir. 2007). In this case, Plaintiff sues District Court Judge Lonny R. Suko for “violating the laws of the society of man.” Dkt. 1.

Plaintiff does not allege danger of any physical injury, much less an imminent serious physical danger which is “ready to take place” or “hanging threateningly over [his] head.” *Cervantes*, 493 F.3d at 1056. Therefore, the imminent danger exception does not apply in this case, and Plaintiff is subject to the three-strikes rule.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff may not proceed IFP in this matter as he has incurred at least three strikes under 42 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Therefore, the Court recommends Plaintiff be ordered to pay the \$400.00 filing fee within thirty days of the District Court’s order and, if the fee is not paid, dismiss this case without prejudice.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the parties shall have fourteen (14) days from service of this Report to file written objections. *See also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those

¹ This court may take notice of judicial proceedings in another court. *See U.S. ex rel. Robinson Rancheria Citizens Council v. Borneo, Inc.*, 971 F.2d 244, 248 (9th Cir. 1992).

1 objections for purposes of appeal. *Thomas v Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time
2 limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the Clerk is directed to set the matter for consideration on
3 **November 20, 2015**, as noted in the caption.

4 DATED this 2nd day of November, 2015.

6
7 

8 Karen L. Strombom
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26